

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,602	03/29/2004	Chi-Yee Yeh	MR2863-155	9754
4586	7590 11/08/2006		EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101			HALPERN, MARK	
	T CITY, MD 21043		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1731	
			DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/810,602	YEH, CHI-YEE				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mark Halpern	1731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHI - Exte afte - If No - Fail Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Downsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 To SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Diperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the unit of the provision of the prov	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 A	<u>ugust 2006</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers		,				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmer	• •	_					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

DETAILED ACTION

1) Applicant's election without traverse of invention I drawn on claims 1-10, in the reply filed on 8/26/2006, is acknowledged. Applicant cancels the non-elected invention claims 11-15.

Specification

2) References are made to foreign publications from Taiwan, patent no. 500,746 in [0006] and patent no. 223,008 in [0007]. Copies of the above publications are required to verify the information recited in the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1731

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3) Claims 1-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Eto (US 2004/0045690)(pub. date 3/11/2004). Eto discloses a molded pulp article made in a paper-molding machine, the article is made from a pulp mixture that contains anionic substances, and non-ionic and cationic substances mixed together with the pulp [0027].

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 1-10, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Eto, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

Application/Control Number: 10/810,602

Art Unit: 1731

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4) Claims 1-10, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application No. 10/935,078. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the present claims and the claims of the copending application recite the formation of a pulp-molded product that contains anionic, non-ionic and cationic compounds

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

5) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 571-272-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,602

Art Unit: 1731

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Halpern V
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1731